1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

1718

19

20

21

22

23

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA

BRANDON RISHAWN CREWS,

CASE NO. 3:23-cv-6145

Plaintiff,

ORDER

PATTY JACKSON, et al.,

v.

Defendants.

Plaintiff Brandon Rishawn Crews is a pre-trial detainee at Pierce County

Jail. He brought claims against Defendants Pierce County, Correctional Officer

Desmond, Correctional Officer Smith, Sergeant Patty Jackson, and NaphCare. He alleges that the conditions at Pierce County Jail have placed him at risk of contracting and spreading diseases.

This matter comes before the Court on United States Magistrate Judge
Theresa L. Fricke's Report and Recommendation. Dkt. No. 17. Judge Fricke
recommends that this Court grant NaphCare's motion to dismiss for a couple of
reasons. Crews has not made any allegations concerning any official policy or that
NaphCare itself made intentional decisions about Crews's confinement. Even if

ORDER - 2

Crews did identify a policy, practice or custom, he did not allege that this policy amounted to a deliberate indifference to his constitutional rights under the Fourteenth Amendment, or that the policy is or was the moving force behind the constitutional violation.

No one has objected to the R&R and the time for objecting has passed. See generally Dkt. Because there were no objections, the Court may adopt the R&R if it is satisfied there are not clear errors on the face of the record. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) Advisory Committee's Note to 1983 Amendment. The Court agrees with Judge Fricke's reasoning that the Eighth Amendment claim should be dismissed with prejudice because Plaintiff is a pre-trial detainee. See Bell v. Wolfish, 441 U.S. 520, 535 n.16 (1979) ("The Court of Appeals properly relied on the Due Process Clause rather than the Eighth Amendment in considering the claims of pretrial detainees."). But Plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment claim is dismissed without prejudice because Plaintiff may be able to overcome some of the deficiencies of the complaint if he is given an opportunity to amend.

Based on its review of the R&R and the remaining record, the Court finds and ORDERS:

- 1) The Court ADOPTS the R&R. Dkt. No. 17.
- 2) NaphCare's motion to dismiss is GRANTED without prejudice; and,
- 3) Plaintiff is granted leave to amend his claims against NaphCare.

Dated this 21st day of June, 2024.

Case 3:23-cv-06145-JNW-TLF Document 18 Filed 06/21/24 Page 3 of 3

Jamal N. Whitehead

United States District Judge

ORDER - 3